

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**STATE OF MISSOURI**

**v.  
PIERRE M. WARD**

**RESPONDENT,**

**APPELLANT.**

---

DOCKET NUMBER WD77681

DATE: November 10, 2015

---

Appeal From:

Cass County Circuit Court  
The Honorable William B. Collins, Judge

---

Appellate Judges:

Special Division: James E. Welsh, Presiding Judge, Gary D. Witt, Judge and Andrea  
Vandeloecht, Special Judge

---

Attorneys:

Richard A. Starnes, Jefferson City, MO, for respondent.

Margaret M. Johnston, Columbia, MO, for appellant.

---

**MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY**

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**STATE OF MISSOURI,**

**RESPONDENT,**

**v.**

**PIERRE M. WARD,**

**APPELLANT.**

No. WD77681

Cass County

Before Special Division: James E. Welsh, Presiding Judge, Gary D. Witt, Judge and Andrea Vandeloecht, Special Judge

Appellant Pierre M. Ward ("Ward") was convicted by a jury of first-degree robbery, Section 569.020, armed criminal action, Section 571.015, and first-degree burglary, Section 569.160, and sentenced by the trial court to a total of fifteen years of imprisonment. The charges arose out of the break-in and robbery of a home, which, the State argued at trial, was aided and abetted by Ward. Ward now appeals. In his first point, Ward argues there was insufficient evidence that he could have reasonably anticipated or actually knew a gun would be used during the robbery to support his convictions of first-degree robbery and armed criminal action. In his second point, Ward argues the trial court abused its discretion in admitting certain "bad character" evidence that was unfairly prejudicial and undermined his rights to due process and a fair trial.

**WE AFFIRM.**

(1) The trial court did not err in denying Ward's motion for judgment of acquittal and imposing judgment and sentence for first-degree robbery and armed criminal action because there was sufficient evidence to support his convictions under a theory of accomplice liability, independent of any actual knowledge a firearm would be used in the crime. In addition, even if the State were required to prove Ward had advance knowledge a firearm would be used in the commission of the crime, the evidence at trial was sufficient to support such a finding.

(2) The trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting evidence that Ward referred to a woman as a "cash cow" because the evidence was probative as to the identity of the perpetrators of the robbery and helped explain Ward's connection to this woman, who was a neighbor of the victims. In addition, even if it was error to admit the evidence, the error was not prejudicial because there is not a reasonable probability that it affected the outcome of the trial.

Opinion by Gary D. Witt, Judge

November 10, 2015

\*\*\*\*\*

This summary is UNOFFICIAL and should not be quoted or cited.
---